

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			1	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,758	10/17/2003	Michael T.K. Ling	FLM-5686A	1992
MARK J. BUO	7590 04/30/2007 NAIUTO ESO		EXAM	INER
ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL			HAIDER, SAIRA BANO	
	ITERNATIONAL INC., LAW DEPARTMENT ER PARKWAY, DF3-2E ART UNIT PAPER NUM		PAPER NUMBER	
DEERFIELD, I	•		1711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u> </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/688,758	LING ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saira Haider	1711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	lress
THE REPLY FILED 26 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF			
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final reject	ion.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	06.07(f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing date.	136(a) and the appropria of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Off	ate extension fee riate extension fee ice action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further compared (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		iected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		ill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	is necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by			
See Continuation Sheet.		il collution for allowa	nice because.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other: Note the attached Interview Summary.	(F 10/36/00) Fapel NO(S).		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The examiner maintains the 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-13, 18, 19, 34, and 35 as being unpatentable over Woo in view of Laurin.

Woo discloses two [(a) and (d)] of the four components [(a)-(d)] of the outermost first layer; the Laurin reference teaches the remaining components, as discussed in the Final Rejection mailed on 1/25/2007.

In reference to the solution contact second layer, it is noted that Woo discloses a core layer (callout 16), which is a solution contact layer and is comprised of a non-PVC containing material of a multiple component polymer blend (col. 3, lines 18-37). The core layer of Woo, i.e. the claimed second layer, contacts the outermost layer via the tie layer (callout 14) (Fig. 1). Thus meeting the claimed limitation regarding "the second layer contacting the first layer". It is noted that the term "contacting" as utilized in the aforementioned phrase does not require face to face contact and does not preclude the presence of an intermediate layer between the claimed layers.

In reference to claims 4, 15, and 16, it is noted that the prior art does not disclose or render obvious the claimed polymer blend of the second layer.

In reference to independent claim 20, the prior art does not disclose or render obvious the claimed outermost second layer.

Thus, the following claims are rendered allowable over the prior art: 4, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24-26, 28-33, 36, and 37.

Additionally, the 112, paragraph 1 and 2 rejections are withdrawn.

In view of the examiner's maintenance of the abovementioned 103(a) rejection, the application is not in condition for allowance Thus, this Advisory Action is being issued.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700